



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,243	09/17/2003	Craig S. Hahn	28679/05404	3312
24024	7590	02/20/2004	EXAMINER	
CALFEE HALTER & GRISWOLD, LLP 800 SUPERIOR AVENUE SUITE 1400 CLEVELAND, OH 44114			LUEBKE, RENEE S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/605,243

Applicant(s)

HAEHN & JOHNSON & LARSON & CUSTER

Examiner

Renee S. Luebke

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 8, 15 and 16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2833

1. The drawings are objected to because the wires 10 appear to be grossly out of proportion. If the pins 12 are in the connector 14 and the wires are in the spacer 16 when assembled, the length of the wires must be only about the same as the thickness of the spacer. Although drawings need not be to scale, they should be understandable. Lacking a cross-sectional view of the assembled device, the wires should give a reasonable appearance of fitting where they belong, and be clear without studying the specification. Also, "26" does not appear to indicate any connectors as stated in the specification. In addition, the lead line to reference numeral 32 should be extended to indicate the lens, not the top surface of the lens piece. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The disclosure is objected to because it refers to a "rubber, wire seal" and a "rubber seal" in paragraph 17 that are not found in the figures. In addition, since all the other parts are identified, it is unclear where the seal (or seals) is. Appropriate corrections are required.

3. Claims 1-16 are objected to because of the following informalities:

- The arrangement of the pins and wires in claims 1, 8 and 16 is unclear. If the pins extend through the body and the spacer and are capable of contacting the connections on the circuit board, where do the wires go?

- Claims 6, 9 and 14 contradict the specification and figures. These claims require that the pins be in connection with the connectors; the specification and figures indicate that the wires are intermediate the pins and connectors.

- Claim 12 is redundant, repeating section **e** of claim 9 from which it depends.

Art Unit: 2833

- The end of claim 15 is redundant, repeating section *f* of claim 9 from which it depends.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-6 and 9-14, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameyama. This connector comprises a connector body 7, pins 52, a spacer 6, a printed circuit board 2, a lens 10f, and a collar 3. On the board is a camera, instead of an LED. However, the purpose and features on a circuit board are known to be exchangeable based on a user's needs. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include an LED for indication purposes on the board of Kameyama. In regard to claims 2, 3, 10 and 11, it is noted that the circuit board and lens piece of Kameyama are not permanently attached to the other components; it is seen to be removable and replaceable.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The connector of DeCenzo comprises a body, pins, a circuit board and a collar arranged in a manner similar to that of the present invention.

7. Any response to this action **may be mailed to:**

Art Unit: 2833

**Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

For additional information regarding this new address, which was effective May 1, 2003, see *Correspondence with the United States Patent and Trademark Office*, 68 Fed. Reg. 14332 (March 25, 2003).

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (Receptionist)
2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Mrs. Renee Luebke whose telephone number is (571) 272-2009.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Paula Bradley, can be reached at (571) 272-2001.



Renee S. Luebke
Primary Patent Examiner
January 30, 2004